

Project Research Dossier

Inco Network — confidentiality layer for existing blockchains

Author: apap9067 (Squad: shangus) | Date: 2026-10-02 | The Eastern Campaigns — Seeing the Long Game
Every factual claim below is tagged to a primary source listed on page 2. Nothing here is investment advice.

0. Eligibility against the quest constraint

The constraint is: no public raise and no active ICO/TGE. Inco satisfies both, and this is checkable rather than assumed. All disclosed capital came from private rounds (S1, S2); there is no token, no sale page, and no tokenomics anywhere in the project's own documentation (S3, S4). I selected it for that reason: a genuine pre-TGE subject forces the dossier to separate what is verifiable from what is still unwritten.

1. What it builds, and why it matters

Inco describes itself as "Full-Stack Privacy for Blockchains" and is explicit that it is a confidentiality layer integrating with existing chains, not a new chain (S3). Developers get encrypted EVM types (ebool, eaddress, euint256) plus arithmetic, comparison and access-control operations, so contracts can hold encrypted state "without modifying the underlying blockchain" (S5).

Why it matters: public-by-default state is the blocker for on-chain payroll, sealed-bid auctions, undercollateralised credit and hidden-information games. The competing approach is a dedicated privacy chain, which fragments liquidity. Inco's bet is that confidentiality ships faster as a module on chains that already have users. That bet is testable — see the deployment record below.

2. Verifiable status (dated, first-party)

- **2026-09-02** — Confidential Token (cToken) App and SDK went live on Base Mainnet (S3). This is the first mainnet surface, not a testnet claim.
 - **2026-08-27** — Deployed on Celo, positioned for private stablecoin payments (S3).
 - **Networks** — Live on Base; Base Sepolia testnet; Solana/SVM in beta on Devnet (S3, S4).
 - **Code** — 45 public repositories under the Inco-fhevm GitHub org, with commits through Sep 2026. Most-starred: confidential-erc20-framework (88), comfy-consumer (21), lightning-rod DDK (6) (S6).
 - **Capital** — \$5M strategic round led by a16z CSX announced 2025-04-24, adding Coinbase Ventures, with follow-on from 1kx, OrangeDAO, South Park Commons and Script Capital; stated total funding \$10M (S1, S2).
-

3. Tokenomics: FDV, circulating, vesting, emissions, allocations

There are none published. As of 2026-10-02 the project's own site and documentation contain no token, no allocation table, no vesting schedule and no emissions policy (S3, S4). The architecture overview still says "Whitepaper coming soon" (S7). Any FDV or circulating figure circulating for Inco today is therefore unsourced, and I am not going to manufacture one.

What that means in practice: the tokenomics section of this dossier is a verification checklist, not a valuation. Before any allocation decision the following artifacts must exist and be read in full — (a) total supply and genesis allocation split; (b) investor and team percentages reconciled against the \$10M disclosed raise; (c) cliff length and vesting shape per bucket; (d) emissions schedule and what they pay for; (e) whether testnet or cToken usage converts into a claim.

Project Research Dossier — Inco Network (page 2)

4. Unlock and dilution risk — structural model

Because real percentages are unpublished, the honest output is a model the reader can re-run the moment they are. The shape that matters is cliff vs linear: a cliff concentrates supply into a single date, while linear spreads it. With a 12-month cliff followed by 24-month linear vesting — the most common structure for privately funded infrastructure — the dangerous month is the cliff date, when an entire bucket becomes liquid at once, not the steady drip afterwards.

Illustrative only — these are NOT Inco figures. If insiders (team + investors) held 50% on a 12m cliff + 24m linear, then at month 12 roughly 2.1% of total supply unlocks in one day and about 2.1% per month after. At 60% insiders the same structure puts about 2.5% per month into the market. The sensitivity that dominates is the insider share, not the vesting length; a 10-point swing in insider allocation moves monthly sell pressure by about 20%.

Decision rule I would apply: treat any insider allocation above 55% combined with a single hard cliff as a structural red flag, and require the emissions schedule to be read alongside it, because emissions can double the effective float growth that vesting tables alone imply.

5. Team verification signals: verifiable vs. marketing

- **Verifiable** — Shipped code is public and continuously updated (45 repos, S6). Mainnet deployment dates are first-party and specific (S3). The investor list is named on the project's own site and corroborated by a company-issued press release (S2, S3).
 - **Marketing** — "Full-Stack Privacy" and "robust security and reliability" are positioning, not evidence (S3, S5). The investor roster signals diligence by others; it is not a technical audit and should not be read as one.
 - **Not verifiable today** — No audit report is published or linked anywhere in the documentation index (S4). No named operator for the production infrastructure. No whitepaper (S7). Individual team identities are not asserted on the pages I could reach.
-

6. Key risks

- **Technical** — The Confidential Compute Server runs inside a Trusted Execution Environment (S5). TEEs are a hardware trust assumption, not a cryptographic one: a vendor-level enclave break degrades confidentiality for every application at once. With no published audit, this is currently unreviewed by any third party I can cite.
 - **Centralisation** — The documentation does not say who operates the Confidential Compute Server, how decryption keys are custodied, or what authorises a decryption beyond an EIP-712 signature path on the client (S5). For a confidentiality product this is the single most important unanswered question.
 - **Execution** — Mainnet surface is roughly one month old (2026-09-02, S3). Integration breadth (Base, Celo, Solana beta) is being added before the trust model is documented, which raises the cost of a later architectural correction.
 - **Governance / incentives** — No token means no on-chain governance and no published alignment mechanism. Whatever is designed later will be designed after \$10M of private capital is already in the cap table, which historically biases first allocation tables toward insiders.
 - **Legal / regulatory** — Confidentiality tooling aimed at stablecoin payments (the Celo positioning, S3) sits closest to transmission and AML scrutiny. Any future token would inherit that exposure on top of ordinary securities questions.
-

7. Disclosure

I hold no position in Inco and there is no position to hold — no token exists. I have no equity, advisory role, referral arrangement or paid relationship with Inco or any investor named here. I am a participant in a rewarded Legion Republic community campaign and earn Valor Points for producing this dossier; that is my only incentive, and it is paid regardless of what I conclude. This is research, not investment advice.

8. Primary sources

- S1 inco.org/blog/inco-raises-5m-to-accelerate-development-of-confidentiality-layer-for-blockchains
- S2 GlobeNewswire company release, 2025-04-24 — Inco Raises \$5M in Strategic Round Led by a16z CSX
- S3 inco.org — homepage: self-description, investor list, dated deployment announcements
- S4 docs.inco.org/llms.txt — full documentation index (absence of audit / token / roadmap pages)
- S5 docs.inco.org/architecture/components — component descriptions, TEE, client library
- S6 github.com/orgs/Inco-fhevm/repositories — 45 public repos, languages, stars, last-updated
- S7 docs.inco.org/architecture/overview — modular positioning, "Whitepaper coming soon"

Accessed 2026-10-02. Absence claims (no audit, no tokenomics, no whitepaper) are statements about these sources on that date.